



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/364,070 | 07/30/1999 | AKIHIRO SUZUKI | 3327.2062-01 | 8907 |

22852 7590 12/15/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/364,070

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/544,076.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

3. The limitation of "wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure" is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2624

5. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bain (US 5,287,434).

Regarding claim 21: Bain et al teaches a job scheduling device (PC 14, column 3, lines 50-55) comprising: a queue, (fig. 4, column 8, lines 35-40) that stores print jobs (job, fig. 2, J1, J2, ..., fig. 1) which include print data and attribute information (column 8, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 55-69) relating to a print job output result (e.g., the print job is being printed ahead of other jobs would resulted in a faster outputted print job); scheduling means (the routine of the processor 19 that schedule print job according to the type of printer and priority, column 8, lines 25-35) for scheduling the print jobs stored in the queues; and attribute modifying means (routine block 78, column 8, lines 1-8) for modifying the attribute information (priority, column 8, line 2) of the print job stored in the queue when an instruction (change request message, column 8, lines 1-8) for modifying the attribute information (priority, column 8, line 2) of the print job is received; and wherein the attribute information is chosen from at least one of paper size (assign the print job to a particular stock/paper size, column 5, lines 45-50, column 4, lines 40-46), tray number and the availability of double side printing.

Note: The claim is claiming "at least one"; i.e, the attribute information might include other attribute information such as the "priority" that was disclosed by Bain.

Regarding claim 22: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means modifies the attribute information of the print job when the attribute information of the print job can be modified (inherent properties of modifying; it is impossible (can not) to

modify something when the something is impossible to be modified. I.e., the something can be modified only when the something can be modified).

Regarding claim 23: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means modifies the attribute information of the print job when the instruction is free from errors (instruction is free from error is being interpreted as the microprocessor would recognize the change request message as a change request message. Errors in the change request message means the microprocessor would not recognize the change request message. The microprocessor change the attribute in response to a change request message/instruction, column 8, lines 1-10. Therefore, the microprocessor would change attribute only when the instruction is free from error).

Regarding claim 24: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means determines whether the attribute information of the print job can be modified based on the status of the print job (column 8, lines 1-10, based on whether the print job is being distributed to a printer).

Regarding claim 25: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means determines that the instruction has an error (78, fig. 2, column 8, lines 1-10, the attribute modifying means must determines if the instruction can be processed; the examiner interprets that the event that the instruction can not be processed, e.g., the job is being distributed to a printer, is an error) when the instruction includes an attribute that is not supported by the job scheduling device (the change of priority of a print job is not being supported during the time the print job is being distributed to a printer, column 8, lines 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al. (US 5,287,434) in view of Lobiondo (US 5,287,194)

Regarding claim 15: Bain teaches a job scheduling device (PC 14, column 3, lines 50-55) which sequentially stores jobs, (job, fig. 4, J1, J2..., fig. 1) for which processing requests (the request of user of how to process print job, column 4, lines 35-46) were received, in a queue (column 8, lines 35-40) and sequentially processes the jobs (search for the highest priority job to be printed, column 10, lines 40-46, i.e., process the job in the sequence from highest priority to lowest priority) held in the queue using a job execution section, (the routine of processor that distribute a print job to a printer, column 11, lines 58-63), the job scheduling device comprising: a plurality of queues (Q1-Qn, fig. 1) provided corresponding to a status (the job to be printed by a certain type of printer, column 8, lines 25-35) of a sequential job process (queue, inherently processes jobs sequentially/in order); and scheduling means (the routine of the processor 19 that schedules print job, using queues, according to the type of printer and priority, column 8, lines 25-35) for scheduling the jobs using the plurality of queues; and recovery means (the routine of the processor that restarts job such that each job

Art Unit: 2624

continues on the same printer, column 15, lines 20-25, column 17, lines 25-35) for recovering the status (state, column 15, lines 20-25) of each of the jobs (column 15, lines 20-25) being held in the plurality of queues, at the time of recovery from a failure, (recover from the failure to start the spooler due to termination, column 15, lines 12-25) if any failure occurred while the jobs are being scheduled by the scheduling means, (the processor is processing (scheduling) jobs on printers, column 14, lines 62-68, column 15, lines 1-12, when termination of spooler occurs) wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status (column 15, lines 1-20, teaches to change the processing state of the print job at the time of failure to a wait state. A wait state is a state previous to a processing state because it is waiting to be processed) at the time of failure.

Bain does not teach receiving processing request from terminals.

Lobiondo, in the same area of using a job scheduler device (column 3, lines 40-45) for scheduling print jobs, to be printed by printers, (column 4, lines 45-50), using printer queue (430, fig. 4), teaches the job scheduler device (scheduler 50, column 3, line 41) would receive and schedule print job processing request (criteria of print job, column 3, lines 35-50) from different terminals. (Workstation 30, column 3, lines 25-35)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bain's job scheduling device to receive print job processing request from different terminals.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bain's job scheduling device by the teaching

Art Unit: 2624

of Lobiondo because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user at any local area within the network of the scheduling device and the different terminals to control printing of a job, as taught by Lobiondo, at column 2, lines 32-35; and (b) it would have allowed the job scheduling device to schedule print jobs for different users at different locations (terminals) and increased the usage of the system.

Note: Bain teaches that the processor is controlled by software routine, column 3, lines 5-35, and lines 55-56. It is inherent that different functions carried out by a processor are controlled by different software codes or routines when a processor is run by software.

Regarding claims 16, 18: Bain et al teaches a job scheduling device (PC 14, column 3, lines 50-55) for storing, in a queue, (fig. 4, column 8, lines 35-40) print jobs (job, fig. 2, J1, J2, ..., fig. 1) which include print data and attribute information (column 8, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 55-69) and for which processing requests (the request of user of how to process print job, column 4, lines 34-46) were received and for sequentially printing the print jobs held in the queue (search for the highest priority job to be printed, column 10, lines 40-46, i.e., print job in the sequence from highest priority to lowest priority) based on the attribute information (job's priority, column 10, lines 40-45) using a job execution section, (the routine of processor that distribute a print job to a printer, column 11, lines 58-63) the job scheduling device comprising: a plurality of queues (Q1-Qn, fig. 1) provided corresponding to states of the jobs; (the job to be printed by a certain type of printer, column 8, lines 25-35), and scheduling means (the routine of the processor 19 that schedule print job according to the type of printer and

Art Unit: 2624

priority, column 8, lines 25-35) for scheduling the jobs using the plurality of queues; and attribute modifying means (routine block 78, column 8, lines 1-8) for modifying the attribute information (priority, column 8, line 2) only when a print job can be changed at the time that an instruction (change request message, column 8, lines 1-8) for modifying the attribute information (priority, column 8, line 2) of the print job is received, and when the instruction is free from errors (instruction is free from error is being interpreted as the microprocessor would recognize the change request message as a change request message. Errors in the change request message means the microprocessor would not recognize the change request message. The microprocessor change the attribute in response to a change request message/instruction, column 8, lines 1-10. Therefore, the microprocessor would change attribute only when the instruction is free from error); and wherein the attribute information is chosen from at least one of paper size (assign the print job to a particular stock/paper size, column 5, lines 45-50, column 4, lines 40-46), tray number and the availability of double side printing.

Note: The claim is claiming "at least one"; i.e, the attribute information might include other attribute information such as the "priority" that was disclosed by Bain.

Bain does not teach receiving processing request from terminals.

Lobiondo, in the same area of using a job scheduler device (column 3, lines 40-45) for scheduling print jobs, to be printed by printers, (column 4, lines 45-50), using printer queue (430, fig. 4), teaches the job scheduler device (scheduler 50, column 3, line 41) would receive and schedule print job processing request (criteria of print job, column 3, lines 35-50) from different terminals. (Workstation 30, column 3, lines 25-35)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bain's job scheduling device to receive print job processing request from different terminals.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bain's job scheduling device by the teaching of Lobiondo because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user at any local area within the network of the scheduling device and the different terminals to control printing of a job, as taught by Lobiondo, at column 2, lines 32-35; and (b) it would have allowed the job scheduling device to schedule print jobs for different users at different locations (terminals) and increased the usage of the system.

Note: Bain teaches the processor is controlled by software routine, column 3, lines 5-35, and lines 55-56. It is inherent that different functions carried out by a processor are controlled by different software codes or routines when a processor is run by software.

Regarding claim 17: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means modifies the attribute information of the print job when the attribute information of the print job can be modified (inherent properties of modifying; it is impossible/can to modify something when the something is impossible to be modified. I.e., the something can be modified only when the something can be modified).

Regarding claim 19: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means determines whether the attribute information of the print job can be modified based on

Art Unit: 2624

the queue in which the print job is stored (column 8, lines 1-10, based on whether the queue is in the process of distributing the print job to a printer).

Regarding claim 20: Bain teaches wherein the attribute modifying means determines that the instruction has an error (78, fig. 2, column 8, lines 1-10, the attribute modifying means must determines if the instruction can be processed; the examiner interprets that the event that the instruction can not be processed, e.g., the job is being distributed to a printer, is an error) when the instruction includes an attribute that is not supported by the job scheduling device (the change of priority of a print job is not being supported during the time the print job is being distributed to a printer, column 8, lines 1-10).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument, that "wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure" is support by the specification, for example, page 132 to page 154. Specifically, page 154, lines 1-4 state: "If any failure arises during the scheduling of jobs, the recovery processing

section 412e recovers the previous state of each of jobs retained in the plurality of queues at the time of recovery from the failure;" has been considered.

10. In reply: The specification pointed out by the applicant clearly states that the status is "at the time of RECOVER from the failure", not "at the time of failure."

Therefore the specification supports the position of the examiner that the limitation of "wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure" is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to applicant's argument that Bain does not teach "the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status at the time of the failure," has been considered.

In reply: Bain teaches recovery means (the routine of the processor that restarts job such that each job continues on the same printer, column 15, lines 20-25, column 17, lines 25-35) for recovering the status (state, column 15, lines 20-25) of each of the jobs (column 15, lines 20-25) being held in the plurality of queues, at the time of recovery from a failure, (recover from the failure to start the spooler due to termination, column 15, lines 12-25) if any failure occurred while the jobs are being scheduled by the scheduling means, (the processor is processing (scheduling) jobs on printers, column 14, lines 62-68, column 15, lines 1-12, when termination of spooler occurs) wherein the status recovered by the recovery means is the status previous to the status (column

15, lines 1-20, teaches to change the processing state of the print job at the time of failure to a wait state. A wait state is a state previous to a processing state because it is waiting to be processed) at the time of failure.

With respect to applicant's argument that Bain does not teach "the attribute information is chosen from at least one of paper size, tray number, and availability of double-side printing," has been considered.

In reply: Bain teaches at least assigning the print job to a particular stock/paper size, column 5, lines 45-50, column 4, lines 40-46.

Note: The claim is claiming "at least one"; i.e, the attribute information might include other attribute information such as the "priority" that was disclosed by Bain.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2624

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892

December 12, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "King Y. Poon". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "King" and last name "Poon" clearly distinguishable.

**KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**